



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,612	05/23/2001	Michael J. Lemon	10012649-1	8359

7590 02/13/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of Abandonment	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/862,612	LEMON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Stevens	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on _____.
 (a) A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 (b) A proposed reply was received on _____, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.
 (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 (c) A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 (d) No reply has been received.

2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 (b) The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due.
 The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____.
 (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.

3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 (b) No corrected drawings have been received.

4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.

5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.


6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on 30 November 2006 and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.

7. The reason(s) below:

See Continuation Sheet

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: No response subsequent to the BPAI decision, rendered 11/30/2006, was received. Examiner called Mr. Neudeck at (970) 898-4931 on 2/5/2007, and left a (courtesy call) message inquiring as to whether further action was taken by Applicant. Mr. Neudeck emailed Mr Dakin apparently stating that the Examiner wanted to know the status of the case. Mr. Dakin then left the Examiner a voice mail message, wanting to talk about the status of the case. The Examiner returned Mr. Dakin's call (twice) on 2/6/2007, intending to leave a message that the Examiner was merely inquiring as to whether further action was taken by the Applicant subsequent to the 11/30/2006 BPAI decision. However, the Examiner was not able to get through to Mr. Dakin at (650) 857-2295 because his "mail box is full".



JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100